arXiv:0809.4640v3 [math.PR] 31 Aug 2009

Sensitivity for Smoluchowski equation

Ismaël Bailleul*†

August 31, 2009

Abstract

This article investigates the question of sensitivity of the solutions μ_t^λ of Smoluchowski equation on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ with respect to parameters λ in the interaction kernel $K^\lambda(.,.)$. It is proved that μ_t^λ is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ function of (t,λ) with values in a good space of measures under the hypotheses $K^\lambda(x,y) \leqslant \varphi(x)\varphi(y)$, for some sub-linear function φ, and $\int \varphi^{4+\varepsilon}(x)\,\mu_0(dx) < \infty$, and that the derivative is the unique solution of a related equation.

Key words. Smoluchowski's coagulation equation, sensitivity.
1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 34A34, Secondary 34A12.

1 Introduction

Smoluchowski equation. Many chemical reactions, such as soot formation [KP07] or flame synthesis of organic or inorganic nanoparticles [Kra06], have in common a microscopic mechanism where particles of different masses evolve in a homogeneous medium. Each of them performs a free thermal motion, with diffusivity depending on its mass, until it approaches enough any other particle. These two particles will then coagulate to create a new one, whose mass will be the sum of the masses of each of its ancestors.

The experimentor have only access to macroscopic quantities such as the concentration of the different masses along time. How can he describe the evolution of these quantities from this microscopic description of the dynamics? Mathematically, we can describe these concentrations as measures μ_t on the space $\mathbb{R}_+^* := (0,+\infty)$ of masses of species. What comes out from experimental measurements are quantities such like the concentration of particles with a mass between such and such number, or, more generally, quantities of the form $(f,\mu_t) \equiv \int f(x)\mu_t(dx)$, for some functions f. Smoluchowski has proposed in [vS16] to describe the evolution of the observations (f,μ_t) in a well mixed system using some symmetric kernel $K(x,y)$ describing the rates at which coagulations occur:

$$\frac{d}{ds}(f,\mu_s) = \frac{1}{2}\int \big\{f(x+y) - f(x) - f(y)\big\}K(x,y)\mu_s(dx)\mu_s(dy). \tag{1.1}$$

Roughly speaking, a particle of mass x coagulates with a particle of mass y at rate $K(x,y)$ to create a particle of mass $x+y$.

Sensitivity. The parameters of an experiment are incorporated into the model dynamics (1.1) as parameters $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in the interaction kernel $K(\cdot,\cdot) = K^\lambda(\cdot,\cdot)$. Binder granulation a priori requires

---

*Statistical Laboratory, Cambridge, Email: i.bailleul@statslab.cam.ac.uk
†This research was supported by the EPSRC grant EP/E01772X/1.

for instance around 10 parameters to describe it ([BGKM07]). In such a situation, it appears to be crucial to investigate whether or not the chemical process under consideration (or its mathematical expression μ_t^λ) really depends on such or such parameter, so as to propose simpler and tractable models where non-significant parameters have been dropped out. As it is often time and money consumming to make tens of experiments to perform this analysis, simulations are used to investigate this question. Essentially two kinds of approaches have been used up to now to compute $\partial_\lambda \mu_t^\lambda$. Both use stochastic particle systems either to estimate the differences $\frac{\mu_t^{\lambda+\epsilon e_i}-\mu_t^\lambda}{\epsilon}$ (for a basis vector e_i of $\mathbb{R}^d$), as in the coming article [KMN09], or to approximate directly $\partial_\lambda \mu_t^\lambda$, as in [KV04]. As strange as it may seem, no justification that $\partial_\lambda \mu_t^\lambda$ does exist has ever been given, which puts the previous investigations on a somewhat hazy mathematical framework.

The aim of this article is to prove that μ_t^λ is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ function of (t, λ) (under proper conditions and in a suitable sense) and that it is the unique solution to some equation. Not only does this fact put the existing approaches on a firm ground, but it also leads to a new particle approximation which happens to be more accurate than any other method. This numerical counterpart will be developed in the companion article [BM09] to this one.

We describe in the remainder of this section the approach we have used to prove the above differentiability result.

Notation. Given a locally bounded non-negative kernel $F(x,y)$ on $\mathbb{R}_+^* \times \mathbb{R}_+^*$ and a Radon measures μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$, one defines a signed Radon measure $F(\mu,\nu)$ setting

$$\forall\, f \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}_+^*), \quad \big(f, F(\mu,\nu)\big) = \int \big\{f(x+y) - f(x) - f(y)\big\} F(x,y)\mu(dx)\nu(dy). \tag{1.2}$$

The approach. From a mathematical point of view, the main difficulty in solving Smoluchowski equation comes from the fact that whilst the weak formulation (1.1) is always a well defined problem (even if this equation has no solution), it is not easy to find a Banach or a Fréchet space of (signed) measures where the differential equation

$$\dot{\mu}_s = \frac{1}{2} K(\mu_s, \mu_s) \tag{1.3}$$

itself is meaningful. This difficulty disappears for bounded kernels, where Smoluchowski equation can be solved in the Banach framework of Radon signed measures equipped with total variation norm.

The computation of $\partial_\lambda \mu_t^\lambda$ is formally straightforward and we are going to see that it is even given by a representation formula. The measures μ_t^λ solving equation (1.3), their derivative with respect to λ should solve the equation

$$\dot{\sigma}_t^\lambda = K^\lambda\left(\mu_t^\lambda, \sigma_t^\lambda\right) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\lambda K^\lambda\left(\mu_t^\lambda, \mu_t^\lambda\right) \tag{1.4}$$

obtained by formal differentiation of equation (1.3) with respect to λ; we have written $\partial_\lambda K^\lambda(x,y)$ for the partial derivative of $K^\lambda(x,y)$ with respect to λ. This equation can be solved, considering first the linearized problem

$$\dot{\rho}_s^\lambda = K^\lambda(\mu_s^\lambda, \rho_s^\lambda) \tag{1.5}$$

in **a)** before using in **b)** the variation of constants method.

a) We introduce a dual evolution equation on functions to study the linear equation (1.5). To that end, define time dependent operators Λ_s^λ on functions setting

$$\Lambda_s^\lambda f(x) = \int \big\{f(x+y) - f(x) - f(y)\big\} K^\lambda(x,y)\mu_s^\lambda(dy). \tag{1.6}$$

These operators satisfy the identity

$$\big(\Lambda_s^\lambda f, \rho\big) = \big(f, K(\mu_s^\lambda, \rho)\big).$$

Now, if one considers the *backwards* linear equation

$$\dot{f}_s = -\Lambda_s^\lambda f_s, \quad s \in [0,t] \text{ and } f_t = f,$$

its solution $\{f_s\}_{0\leqslant s\leqslant t}$ depends linearly on f, so we can write it in the form $U_{s,t}^\lambda f$, for a linear operator $U_{s,t}^\lambda$. This function $U_{s,t}^\lambda f$ has two important properties: As a function of t it satisfies the identity $\frac{d}{dt}U_{s,t}^\lambda f = U_{s,t}^\lambda \Lambda_t^\lambda f$, and if $\{\rho_s^\lambda\}_{s\geqslant 0}$ denotes a solution of equation (1.5), then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{ds}\big(U_{s,t}^\lambda f, \rho_s^\lambda\big) &= \big(-\Lambda_s^\lambda U_{s,t}^\lambda f, \rho_s^\lambda\big) + \big(U_{s,t}^\lambda f, \dot{\rho}_s^\lambda\big)\\ &= -\big(U_{s,t}^\lambda f, K(\mu_s^\lambda, \rho_s^\lambda)\big) + \big(U_{s,t}^\lambda f, K(\mu_s^\lambda, \rho_s^\lambda)\big)\\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

So we see that the solution to the linear equation (1.5) needs to be given by the formula

$$\big(f, \rho_t^\lambda\big) = \big(U_{0,t}^\lambda f, \rho_0\big). \tag{1.7}$$

b) To implement the variation of constants method and solve the affine equation (1.4), introduce as in equation (1.6) the operator

$$\Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} f(x) = \int \big\{f(x+y) - f(x) - f(y)\big\}\partial_\lambda K^\lambda(x,y)\mu_s^\lambda(dy).$$

Note the relations

$$\big(\Lambda_s^\lambda f, \mu_s^\lambda\big) = \Big(f, K^\lambda\big(\mu_s^\lambda, \mu_s^\lambda\big)\Big) \quad \text{and} \quad \big(\Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} f, \mu_s^\lambda\big) = \Big(f, \partial_\lambda K^\lambda\big(\mu_s^\lambda, \mu_s^\lambda\big)\Big).$$

Defining the measures σ_t^λ by the formula

$$\big(f, \sigma_t^\lambda\big) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \Big(U_{0,s}^\lambda \Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} U_{s,t}^\lambda f, \mu_0\Big)\, ds \overset{(1.7)}{=} \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \Big(\Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} U_{s,t}^\lambda f, \mu_s^\lambda\Big)\, ds \tag{1.8}$$

given by the variation of constants method, it is easy to check that it satisfies a weak form of equation (1.4):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\big(f, \sigma_t^\lambda\big) &= \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t U_{0,s}^\lambda \Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} U_{s,t}^\lambda f\, ds\,,\ \mu_0\right)\\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t U_\lambda^{0,s} \Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} U_{s,t}^\lambda \Lambda_t^\lambda f\, ds, \mu_0\right) + \frac{1}{2}\Big(U_{0,t}^\lambda \Lambda_t^{\partial\lambda} f, \mu_0\Big)\\ &= \Big(\Lambda_t^\lambda f, \sigma_t^\lambda\Big) + \frac{1}{2}\Big(\Lambda_t^{\partial\lambda} f, \mu_t^\lambda\Big)\\ &= \Big(f, K^\lambda\Big(\mu_t^\lambda, \sigma_t^\lambda\Big)\Big) + \Big(f, \frac{1}{2}K^{\partial\lambda}\Big(\mu_t^\lambda, \mu_t^\lambda\Big)\Big);\end{aligned}$$

so one must have $\dfrac{\partial \mu_t^\lambda}{\partial\lambda} = \sigma_t^\lambda$ in one sense or another[1], and formula (1.8) provides a representation for it.

---

[1] This measure σ_t^λ is the measure provided by the variation of constant formula.

How far from full justification is this argument? In the case of uniformly bounded kernels K^λ, we shall see in section 2 that everything is meaningful in the Banach framework of signed measures equipped with total variation distance, its dual space being the space of bounded functions equipped with the supremum norm. Yet, no such satisfactory framework is available for unbounded kernels; we shall thus use an approximation procedure in section 3 to extend the result. The main result (theorem 12) states that the function $(t, \lambda) \mapsto \mu_t^\lambda$ is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ function with values in a good space of measures and that it is the only solution of a weaker version of equation (1.4) under proper conditions.

The idea to investigate a linearized Smoluchowski equation was first used in Kolokoltsov's paper [Kol07] to see how μ_t depends on its initial value. We use here the same tools (theorems 19, 21, 22) as in that paper. We shall compare in section 4, **a)** the present work with the work of Kolokoltsov. Note that the simplified proof of a useful lemma of Kolokoltsov, given in section 4, **b)** and used in section 3.2, might be of some interest for itself.

Notations. All functions and measures are defined on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ throughout the text.

- We shall use the notation $\mu^{\otimes 2}(dxdy)$ for the product measure $\mu(dx)\mu(dy)$.
- As the expression $f(x+y)-f(x)-f(y)$ will appear numerous times in the text, it will be useful to abbreviate it into $\{f\}(x, y)$. In these terms, the weak version (1.1) of Smoluchowski equation may be written

$$\frac{d}{dt}(f, \mu_t) = \frac{1}{2}\int \{f\}(x, y)K(x, y)\mu_t(dx)\mu_t(dy).$$

2 Sensitivity for bounded kernels

We consider in this section Smoluchowski equation (1.1) for a family $\{K^\lambda\}_\lambda$ of interaction kernels, bounded some constant M. We are going to recall in section 2.1 why the strong version (1.3) of Smoluchowski equation is well defined in a good Banach framework. The classical tools of differential equations will then give us for free existence, uniqueness and regularity results of the solutions $\{\mu_t^\lambda\}_{t\geqslant 0}$ to equation (1.3). We shall then take profit in section 2.2 of the fact that the derivative $\sigma_t^\lambda = \partial_\lambda \mu_t^\lambda$ solves a time-non-homogeneous *linear* equation to get an explicit formula for it which will be useful in the sequel.

2.1 Existence and uniqueness in the bounded case: a quick overview

Notations. A Banach framework

- Denote by B_0 the Banach space of bounded measurable functions, equipped with the supremum norm $\|.\|_0$,
- by $\|\rho\|_0$ the total variation of a signed Radon measure ρ, and by

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = \{\mu \text{ Radon measure }; \|\rho\|_0 < \infty\}.$$

Note that

$$\|\rho\|_0 = \sup\big\{(f, \rho)\,;\, f \in B_0, \|f\|_0 \leqslant 1\big\}$$

and that the space $(\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0)$ is complete since it is the dual space of the complete space $\big(\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}), \|.\|_\infty\big)$. We shall denote by $\mathcal{M}_0^+$ the sub-space of non-negative elements of $\mathcal{M}_0$.

The following elementary result is the main reason why everything works well in the bounded case.

LEMMA **1.** *The Radon measure $K(\mu,\mu)$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}_0$ if μ does.*

◁ PROOF – For any $f \in B_0$, $\big|\big(f, K(\mu,\mu)\big)\big| \leqslant 3\|f\|_0 M \|\mu\|_0^2$. ▷

We now see that the Smoluchowski equation (1.3): $\dot{\mu}_s = \frac{1}{2} K(\mu_s, \mu_s)$, is meaningful in $\mathcal{M}_0$.

PROPOSITION **2.** *Equation* (1.3) *has a well defined flow of solutions in* $\big(\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0\big)$.

◁ PROOF – It suffices to see that the vector field K is locally Lipschitz. But given μ and ν in $\mathcal{M}_0$, one can write

$$\big(\mu^{\otimes 2} - \nu^{\otimes 2}\big)(dx \otimes dy) = \mu(dx)(\mu-\nu)(dy) + \nu(dy)(\mu-\nu)(dx).$$

Nothing more is needed to get, for any $f \in B_0$, the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\big(f, K(\mu,\mu)\big) - \big(f, K(\nu,\nu)\big)\big| &= \Big|\int \{f\}(x,y) K(x,y) \big(\mu^{\otimes 2} - \nu^{\otimes 2}\big)(dx \otimes dy)\Big| \\ &\leqslant 3\|f\|_0 M \big(\|\mu\|_0 + \|\nu\|_0\big) \|\mu - \nu\|_0,\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\big\|K(\mu,\mu) - K(\nu,\nu)\big\|_0 \leqslant 3M\big(\|\mu\|_0 + \|\nu\|_0\big)\|\mu-\nu\|_0. \tag{2.1}$$

▷

Given an initial condition μ_0, denote by $T(\mu_0)$ the upper endpoint of the interval on which the solution started from μ_0 is defined. The dynamics $\mu_0 \mapsto \mu_t$ has the property that it preserves the cone $\mathcal{M}_0^+$.

PROPOSITION **3.** *If $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0^+$ so does μ_t, $0 \leqslant t < T(\mu_0)$.*

◁ PROOF – The idea of the proof is to find a non-negative function θ_t such that the transformed measure $\rho_t := \theta_t \mu_t$ solves a differential equation which preserves $\mathcal{M}_0^+$ in a obvious way[2]. See [Nor99], proposition 2.2, for instance. ▷

As a result, if μ_0 is non-negative, one has

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\mu_t\|_0 = \frac{d}{dt}(1, \mu_t) = -\frac{1}{2}\int K(x,y)\mu_t(dx)\mu_t(dy) \leqslant 0$$

and the path $\{\mu_t\}_{0 \leqslant t < T(\mu_0)}$ stays in a ball where the vector field K is (globally) Lipschitz. This explains why the solution is actually defined on $[0,\infty)$.

2.2 Sensitivity

Let now $\{K^\lambda(.,.)\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{U}}$ be a family of symmetric non-negative kernels on $\mathbb{R}_*^+$ depending in a $\mathcal{C}^2$ way in a parameter λ belonging to some open set $\mathcal{U}$ of some $\mathbb{R}^p$. We shall suppose that $K^\lambda(.,.)$ and it first and second derivatives with respect to λ are uniformly bounded by some constant M. We shall write $K^{\partial\lambda}(x,y)$ for the derivative of $K^\lambda(x,y)$ with respect to λ; one defines the measure $K^{\partial\lambda}(\mu,\mu)$ as in (1.2).

THEOREM 4 (Sensitivity for bounded kernels)**.** *The measures $\mu_t^\lambda \in (\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0)$ are differentiable with respect to λ and their derivatives σ_t^λ solve the 'variation' equation*

$$\dot{\sigma}_t^\lambda = K^\lambda\left(\mu_t^\lambda, \sigma_t^\lambda\right) + \frac{1}{2}K^{\partial\lambda}\left(\mu_t^\lambda, \mu_t^\lambda\right) \tag{2.2}$$

---

[2] Which is not the case of Smoluchowski equation. One uses the same method in the study of Boltzmann equation.

We prove this result as a direct application of the following

a) Abstract scheme. Let $(X, \|.\|)$ be a Banach space and $\{b^\lambda(.)\}_{\lambda\in\mathcal{U}}$ a family of vector fields on X indexed by elements λ of an open (relatively compact) set $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathbb{R}^p$. We shall denote by a $\cdot$ the derivative with respect to s and by a ' the derivative with respect to λ. Choose $x_0 \in X$ and suppose that for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{U}$ the differential equation

$$\dot{x}_s^\lambda = b^\lambda(x_s^\lambda), \quad x_0^\lambda = x_0, \tag{2.3}$$

has a unique solution on a time interval $[0,T]$ independant of λ. Given some λ_0, write x_s for $x_s^{\lambda_0}$ and $b(.)$ for $b^{\lambda_0}(.)$.

1. Assume that for each $x \in X$ the function $\lambda \in \mathcal{U} \mapsto b^\lambda(x) \in (X, \|.\|)$ is differentiable, and that $\partial_\lambda b^\lambda(x)$ is a continuous function of x;

write $b'(x) = \partial_\lambda b^\lambda(x)_{|\lambda=\lambda_0}$. The following theorem states sufficient conditions under which x_s^λ is differentiable with respect to λ at $\lambda = \lambda_0$; its proof can be found in any reference textbook on differential equations.

THEOREM **5.** *If one can show that*

2. the map $(s,\lambda) \mapsto x_s^\lambda \in (X, \|.\|)$ is continuous on $[0,T]\times\mathcal{U}$,

3. the family $\{\nabla b(x_s)\}_{0\leqslant s\leqslant t}$ of linear operators on X is bounded,

4. given a compact set of $(X, \|.\|)$, there exists an X-valued function $O_2(x,y)$ and a constant M such that for any x and y in the compact one has $\|O_2(x,y)\| \leqslant M\|y-x\|^2$ and

$$b(y) - b(x) = \nabla b(x)(y-x) + O_2(x,y), \tag{2.4}$$

*then **1)** the equation*

$$\dot{\sigma}_s = \nabla b(x_s)\sigma_s + b'(x_s), \quad \sigma_0 = 0, \tag{2.5}$$

has a unique solution in $C^1([0,T],X)$,

***2)** x_s^λ is differentiable with respect to λ in λ_0, and $\partial_\lambda x^\lambda_{s\,|\lambda=\lambda_0} = \sigma_s$.*

b) Proof of theorem 4. In the following lemmas, we check that hypotheses *1* to *4* of theorem 5 hold.

LEMMA **6.** *For each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0$, the map $\lambda \in \mathcal{U} \mapsto K^\lambda(\mu,\mu) \in (\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0)$ is differentiable, with a derivative $K^{\partial\lambda}(\mu,\mu) \in (\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0)$ depending continuously on $\mu \in (\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0)$.*

◁ PROOF – Given $f \in B_0$, apply Taylor formula in a small neighbourhood $\mathcal{V}$ of λ_0 to get

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\big(f, K^\lambda(\mu,\mu) - K^{\lambda_0}(\mu,\mu) - (\lambda-\lambda_0)K^{\partial\lambda}(\mu,\mu)\big)\Big| = \\ &\Big|\int \{f\}(x,y)\big(K^\lambda(x,y) - K^{\lambda_0}(x,y) - (\lambda-\lambda_0)K^{\partial\lambda}(x,y)\big)\mu(dx)\mu(dy)\Big| \\ &\leqslant 3\|f\|_0 \frac{|\lambda-\lambda_0|^2}{2}\max_{\widetilde{\lambda}\in\mathcal{V}}\big|\partial^2_{\widetilde{\lambda}}K^{\widetilde{\lambda}}(x,y)\big|\|\mu\|_0^2.\end{aligned}$$

This proves the differentiability assertion; the continuity of $K^{\partial\lambda}(\mu,\mu)$ with respect to $\mu \in (\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0)$ is easy, and left to the reader. ▷

LEMMA **7.** *The map* $(s,\lambda)\mapsto\mu_s^\lambda\in(\mathcal{M}_0,\|.\|_0)$ *is continuous on* $[0,T]\times\mathcal{U}$.

$\lhd$ PROOF – It is a classical fact in dynamics that it is sufficient to check that the map $(\lambda,\mu)\in\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{M}_0\to K^\lambda(\mu,\mu)$ is locally Lipschitz to get the continuity of $(s,\lambda)\mapsto\mu_s^\lambda\in(\mathcal{M}_0,\|.\|_0)$. Writing

$$K^\lambda(\mu,\mu)-K^{\lambda'}(\nu,\nu)=K^\lambda(\mu,\mu)-K^\lambda(\nu,\nu)+\left(K^\lambda-K^{\lambda'}\right)(\nu,\nu),$$

and using inequality (2.1), Taylor formula, and the fact that $\sup\limits_{x,y\,;\,\ell}\left|K^{\partial\ell}(x,y)\right|\leqslant M$, one obtains

$$\|K^\lambda(\mu,\mu)-K^{\lambda'}(\nu,\nu)\|_0\leqslant 3M\big(\|\mu\|_0+\|\nu\|_0\big)\|\mu-\nu\|_0+3M\|\nu\|_0^2|\lambda-\lambda'|.$$

$\rhd$

The remaining two facts are easily established.

LEMMA **8.**
- *The linear map* $\nu\mapsto K(\mu_s,\nu)$ *takes* $(\mathcal{M}_0,\|.\|_0)$ *into itself and has a uniformly bounded norm for* $s\in[0,T]$. *The same result holds for the map* $\nu\mapsto K^{\partial\lambda}(\mu_s,\nu)$.
- *Let* C *be a compact set of* $(\mathcal{M}_0,\|.\|_0)$. *There exists an* $(\mathcal{M}_0,\|.\|_0)$*-valued function* $O_2(\mu,\mu')$ *such that* $\|O_2(\mu,\mu')\|_0\leqslant m\|\mu-\mu'\|_0^2$ *for some constant* m, *and*

$$\forall\,\mu,\,\mu'\in C,\quad K^{\lambda_0}(\mu',\mu')-K^{\lambda_0}(\mu,\mu)=2K^{\lambda_0}(\mu,\mu'-\mu)+O_2(\mu,\mu'). \tag{2.6}$$

  $K^{\partial\lambda_0}$ *has the same property.*

c) A representation formula for σ_t^λ. As explained in the introduction, one can solve explicitly the variation equation (2.2) solving first its linearized verion (1.5) before using the variation of constant method. The first step is made solving a dual problem to the homogeneous equation, on the space B_0.

Dual linearized Smoluchowski equation. Define for each $\lambda\in\mathcal{U}$, a time-dependent linear vector field Λ_s^λ on B_0, setting for any $f\in B_0$

$$\Lambda_s^\lambda f(x)=\int\big\{f(x+y)-f(x)-f(y)\big\}K^\lambda(x,y)\mu_s^\lambda(dy). \tag{2.7}$$

As $\|\Lambda_s^\lambda\|_0\leqslant 3M(1,\mu_s^\lambda)\leqslant 3M\|\mu_0\|_0$, and μ_s^λ depends continuously on s, the vector field Λ_s^λ on B_0 is continuous with respect to $f\in B_0$ and s. So, given some time $t>0$, the backwards and forwards differential equations

$$\dot{f}_s(x)=-\Lambda_s^\lambda f_s\,(x),\quad f_t\text{ given}, \tag{2.8}$$

are meaningful in B_0, and elementary results on linear differential equations on Banach spaces give the following proposition.

PROPOSITION **9.** *The differential backwards and forwards equations* (2.8) *in* $(B_0,\|.\|_0)$ *have a unique solution, defined for all time. It is of the form* $f_s=U_{s,t}^\lambda f_t$, *for a continuous linear operator* $U_{s,t}^\lambda$ *on* B_0, *with norm* $\leqslant e^{3M\|\mu_0\|_0|t-s|}$. *We also have for any* $f\in B_0$

$$\frac{d}{dt}U_{s,t}^\lambda f=U_{s,t}^\lambda\Lambda_t^\lambda f. \tag{2.9}$$

This operator $U^{\lambda}_{s,t}$ can be used to solve explicitly the linear equation

$$\dot{\rho}^{\lambda}_s = K^{\lambda}(\mu^{\lambda}_s, \rho^{\lambda}_s);$$

(existence and uniqueness of the solution to this linear equation with continuous bounded vector field raises no problem). Indeed, one gets from Smoluchowski equation (1.3) and equation (2.8)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{ds}\big(U^{\lambda}_{s,t}f, \rho_s\big) = -\big(\Lambda^{\lambda}_s U^{\lambda}_{s,t}f, \rho_s\big) + \big(U^{\lambda}_{s,t}f, \dot{\rho}_s\big) \\
&= -\big(U^{\lambda}_{s,t}f, K(\mu_s, \rho_s)\big) + \big(U^{\lambda}_{s,t}f, K(\mu_s, \rho_s)\big) \\
&= 0;
\end{aligned}$$

so the identity $\big(U^{\lambda}_{0,t}f, \rho_0\big) = (f, \rho^{\lambda}_t)$ holds for any $f \in B_0$; thus

$$\rho^{\lambda}_t = \big(U^{\lambda}_{0,t}\big)^* \rho_0.$$

The second step to solve the variation equation: $\dot{\sigma}^{\lambda}_t = K^{\lambda}\left(\mu^{\lambda}_t, \sigma^{\lambda}_t\right) + \frac{1}{2}K^{\partial\lambda}\left(\mu^{\lambda}_t, \mu^{\lambda}_t\right)$, is to use the variation of constant method as explained in the introduction. The following lemma will be used in that process.

LEMMA **10.** *The function* $t \in [0,T] \mapsto \sigma^{\lambda}_t \in \mathcal{M}_0$ *is the only solution in* $\big(\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0\big)$ *of the weak differential equation*

$$\forall\, f \in B_0, \quad \frac{d}{dt}(f, \sigma_t) = \Big(f, K^{\lambda}\big(\mu^{\lambda}_t, \sigma_t\big)\Big) + \frac{1}{2}\Big(f, K^{\lambda}\big(\mu^{\lambda}_t, \mu^{\lambda}_t\big)\Big), \quad \sigma_0 \textit{ given.}$$

◁ PROOF – Since the function $t \in [0,T] \mapsto \sigma^{\lambda}_t \in \mathcal{M}_0$ satisfies the strong equation (2.2), it also satisfies this weak equation. If σ_t and $\overline{\sigma}_t$ are two solutions, then, given any $f \in B_0$, one has

$$\big(f, \sigma_t - \overline{\sigma}_t\big) = \int_0^t \Big(f, K^{\lambda}\big(\mu^{\lambda}_s, \overline{\sigma}_s - \sigma_s\big)\Big) ds = \int_0^t \big(\Lambda^{\lambda}_s f, \overline{\sigma}_s - \sigma_s\big) ds.$$

As the operator Λ^{λ}_s on $\big(B_0, \|.\|_0\big)$ has norm $\leqslant 3M\|\mu_0\|_0$, one gets

$$\big(f, \sigma_t - \overline{\sigma}_t\big) \leqslant 3M\|\mu_0\|_0\|f\|_0 \int_0^t \|\sigma_t - \overline{\sigma}_t\|_0 ds,$$

and so

$$\|\sigma_t - \overline{\sigma}_t\|_0 \leqslant 3M\|\mu_0\|_0\|f\|_0 \int_0^t \|\sigma_s - \overline{\sigma}_s\|_0 ds.$$

One then deduces from Gronwall's formula that $\overline{\sigma}_t = \sigma_t$. ▷

A formula for σ^{λ}_t. Define the map $\Lambda^{\partial\lambda}_s$ on B_0 by the formula

$$\Lambda^{\partial\lambda}_s f(x) = \int \big\{f(x+y) - f(x) - f(y)\big\} K^{\partial\lambda}(x,y)\mu^{\lambda}_s(dy).$$

Notice that the identities

$$\big(\Lambda^{\partial\lambda}_s f, \mu^{\lambda}_s\big) = \big(f, K^{\partial\lambda}_s(\mu^{\lambda}_s, \mu^{\lambda}_s)\big), \quad \text{and} \quad \big(\Lambda^{\lambda}_s f, \mu^{\lambda}_s\big) = \big(f, K^{\lambda}_s(\mu^{\lambda}_s, \mu^{\lambda}_s)\big)$$

hold for any $f \in B_0$.

Proposition **11** (Representation formula for the sensitivity). *One has*

$$(f,\sigma_t^\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \left(U_{0,s}^\lambda \Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} U_{s,t}^\lambda f, \mu_0\right) ds \tag{2.10}$$

for any $f \in B_0$.

◁ Proof – Denote temporarily by $\widehat{\sigma}_t^\lambda$ the measure $f \in B_0 \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \left(U_{0,s}^\lambda \Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} U_{s,t}^\lambda f, \mu_0\right) ds$; it belongs to $\mathcal{M}_0$. The following calculus is fully justified in the Banach framework of $(B_0, \|.\|_0)$. For any $f \in B_0$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}(f,\widehat{\sigma}_t^\lambda) &= \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t U_{0,s}^\lambda \Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} U_{s,t}^\lambda f \, ds \,,\, \mu_0\right) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t U_{0,s}^\lambda \Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} U_{s,t}^\lambda \Lambda_t^\lambda f \, ds, \mu_0\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(U_{0,t}^\lambda \Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} f, \mu_0\right) \\ &= \left(\Lambda_t^\lambda f, \widehat{\sigma}_t^\lambda\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda} f, \mu_t^\lambda\right) \\ &= \left(f, K^\lambda\left(\mu_t^\lambda, \widehat{\sigma}_t^\lambda\right)\right) + \left(f, \frac{1}{2}K^{\partial\lambda}\left(\mu_t^\lambda, \mu_t^\lambda\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\widehat{\sigma}_t^\lambda$ satisfies a weak version of equation (2.2) it coincides with σ_t^λ according to lemma 10. ▷

Remark. The following form of formula (2.10) will be useful in the sequel.

$$(f,\sigma_t^\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \{U_{s,t}^\lambda f(x+y) - U_{s,t}^\lambda f(x) - U_{s,t}^\lambda f(y)\} K^{\partial\lambda}(x,y)\mu_s^\lambda(dx)\mu_s^\lambda(dy)\, ds \tag{2.11}$$

3 From bounded to unbounded kernels

We shall now drop the boundedness hypothesis on the kernels K^λ. Yet, to get some control on the interaction rates, we shall make the hypothesis that one has

$$\forall\, \lambda \in \mathcal{U}, \forall\, x,y \in \mathbb{R}_+^*, \quad K^\lambda(x,y) \leqslant \varphi(x)\,\varphi(y) \tag{3.1}$$

for some sub-additive function φ([3]), greater than 1. We shall also suppose that

$$K^{\partial\lambda}(x,y) \leqslant \varphi(x)\,\varphi(y). \tag{3.2}$$

Last, we shall suppose the existence of a (small) $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$(\varphi^{4+\varepsilon}, \mu_0) < \infty. \tag{3.3}$$

In his paper [Nor99], J. Norris proved that $(\varphi^2, \mu_t^\lambda)$ remains finite on some time interval $\big[0, T(\mu_0)\big)$ if (φ^2, μ_0) is finite. The same argument shows that $(\varphi^{4+\varepsilon}, \mu_t^\lambda)$ also remains finite (on a possibly different time interval, still denoted $\big[0, T(\mu_0)\big)$) if $(\varphi^{4+\varepsilon}, \mu_0)$ is finite. Given some $T < T(\mu_0)$ denote by $C(T)$ a positive constant such that

$$\forall\, t \leqslant T, \quad (\varphi^{4+\varepsilon}, \mu_t) \leqslant C(T). \tag{3.4}$$

The function φ being greater than 1, the other moments $(\varphi^p, \mu_t^\lambda)$, with $1 \leqslant p \leqslant 4+\varepsilon$, will also be bounded above by $C(T)$ on $[0,T]$.

Notation. A metric framework

---

[3] $\varphi(x+y) \leqslant \varphi(x) + \varphi(y)$

- In order to estimate the tail behaviour of measures, we introduce the following **spaces of measures**, indexed by non-negative reals p:

$$\mathcal{M}_p = \big\{\mu\,;\, \|\mu\|_p := (\varphi^p, |\mu|) < \infty\big\}.$$

  Using this notation condition (3.4) reads: $\mu_t \in \mathcal{M}_{4+\varepsilon} \subset \mathcal{M}_1$, for all $0 \leqslant t \leqslant T$.
- To compare the behaviour of non-bounded functions with the behaviour of φ, one defines the increasing family of **function spaces**, indexed by non-negative reals p:

$$B_p = \Big\{f\,;\, \sup \frac{|f|}{\varphi^p} < \infty\Big\};$$

  we shall write $\|f\|_p$ for this supremum. Note that $\|\mu\|_p = \sup\{(f,\mu)\,;\, f \in B_p,\ \|f\|_p \leqslant 1\}$.

The purpose of this section is to prove our main result.

Theorem **12** (Sensitivity for unbounded kernels)**.** *Assume conditions* (3.1), (3.2) *and the moment condition* (3.3)*. Then the map* $(t,\lambda) \in [0,T]\times\mathcal{U} \mapsto \mu_t^\lambda \in \big(\mathcal{M}_1,\, \|.\|_1\big)$*, is a* $\mathcal{C}^1$ *function and its derivative* σ_t^λ *satisfies the following equation for any* $f \in B_0$*.*

$$\Big(f,\sigma_t^\lambda\Big) = \Big(f,\sigma_0^\lambda\Big) + \int_0^t \int \{f\}(x,y)K^\lambda(x,y)\mu_s^\lambda(dx)\sigma_s^\lambda(dy)ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \int \{f\}(x,y)K^{\partial\lambda}(x,y)\mu_s^\lambda(dx)\mu_s^\lambda(dy)ds$$

The function $\sigma_\cdot^\lambda$ *is the only* $\big(\mathcal{M}_1,\, \|.\|_1\big)$*-valued solution of this equation.*

a) Strategy. We shall use an approximation procedure to prove this theorem. Let $\big\{K^{\lambda\,;\,N}\big\}_{N\geqslant 0}$ be a sequence of bounded symmetric kernels converging towards K, and such that $\partial_\lambda K^{\lambda\,;\,N}$ and $\partial_\lambda^2 K^{\lambda\,;\,N}$ are also bounded, with $\big|K^{\lambda\,;\,N}(x,y)\big|$ and $\big|\partial_\lambda K^{\lambda\,;\,N}(x,y)\big|$ bounded above by $\varphi(x)\,\varphi(y)$. Let $\mu_t^{\lambda\,;\,N}$ and $\sigma_t^{\lambda\,;\,N}$ be the measures associated with $K^{\lambda\,;\,N}$ and $\partial_\lambda K^{\lambda\,;\,N}$, constructed in section 2. Theorem 12 will be proved by showing that

1. for each N, the map $(t,\lambda) \in [0,T]\times\mathcal{U} \mapsto \mu_t^{\lambda\,;\,N} \in \big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$, and $\partial_\lambda \mu_t^{\lambda\,;\,N} = \sigma_t^{\lambda\,;\,N}$;
2. the sequence $\big\{\mu_t^{\lambda\,;\,N}\big\}_{N\geqslant 0}$ converges towards μ_t^λ in $\big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$, uniformly with respect to $(t,\lambda) \in [0,T]\times\mathcal{U}$;
3. the sequence $\big\{\sigma_t^{\lambda\,;\,N}\big\}_{N\geqslant 0}$ of its derivatives converges in $\big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$ towards some σ_t^λ, uniformly with respect to $(t,\lambda) \in [0,T]\times\mathcal{U}$.

These points will be proved in paragraph **b)**, sections 3.2 and 3.3 respectively.

b) The first step. We prove point 1 as a warming up; it differs from what was said in section 2 in that $\mu_t^{\lambda\,;\,N}$ is now considered as an element of $\mathcal{M}_1$. We restate this point here as a proposition for future reference.

Proposition **13.** *The map* $(t,\lambda) \in [0,T]\times\mathcal{U} \mapsto \mu_t^{\lambda\,;\,N} \in \big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$ *is, for each* N*, a* $\mathcal{C}^1$ *function, and* $\partial_\lambda\, \mu_t^{\lambda\,;\,N} = \sigma_t^{\lambda\,;\,N}$ *in* $\big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$*.*

Let us prove quickly that the results of section 2 on existence and uniqueness of solutions to Smoluchowski equation, and their dependence on parameters, hold in $\big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$, with the bounded kernel $K^{\lambda\,;\,N}$. Denote by M any of its upper bounds.

LEMMA **14.** *The Radon measure* $K^{\lambda\,;N}(\mu,\mu)$ *belongs to* $\mathcal{M}_1$ *if* μ *does.*

◁ PROOF – For any $f \in B_1$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1$, the inequality $\big|\{f\}(x,y)\big| \leqslant 2\|f\|_1\big(\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\big)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\big(f, K^{\lambda\,;N}(\mu,\mu)\big)\big| &\leqslant 2M\|f\|_1 \int \big(\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\big)\mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\ &\leqslant 4M\|f\|_1\|\mu\|_1^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

▷

PROPOSITION **15.** *The Smoluchowski equation has a well defined flow of solutions in* $\big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$.

◁ PROOF – The following inequalities enable us to see that the vector field $\mu \mapsto K^{\lambda\,;N}(\mu,\mu)$ on $\big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$ is Lipschitz. The function $f \in B_1$ has norm $\leqslant 1$ and $\mu,\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\big(f, K^{\lambda\,;N}(\mu,\mu) - K^{\lambda\,;N}(\nu,\nu)\big)\big| &= 2M\int \big(\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\big)\big(|\mu|(dx)|\mu-\nu|(dy) + |\nu|(dy)|\mu-\nu|(dx)\big) \\ &\leqslant 2M\big(\|\mu\|_1\|\mu-\nu\|_0 + \|\mu\|_0\|\mu-\nu\|_1 + \|\nu\|_0\|\mu-\nu\|_1 + \|\nu\|_1\|\mu-\nu\|_0\big) \\ &\leqslant 4M\big(\|\mu\|_1 + \|\nu\|_1\big)\|\mu-\nu\|_1.\end{aligned}$$

▷

The differentiability of the map $\lambda \in \mathcal{U} \mapsto \mu_t^{\lambda\,;N} \in \big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$ may be shown in the same way as was done in section 2.2 in the framework of $\big(\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0\big)$. One also sees that the operators $\Lambda_s^{\lambda\,;N}$ and $\Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda\,;N}$ are bounded in $\big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$, with norm no greater than $4M\|\mu_s^\lambda\|_1$, so that the explicit formula for $\sigma_t^{\lambda\,;N}$ given in (2.10) holds in $\big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$.

To prove the continuity of $\mu_t^{\lambda\,;N}$ and $\sigma_t^{\lambda\,;N}$ with respect to $(t,\lambda) \in [0,T]\times\mathcal{U}$, one checks that the vector fields appearing in equations (1.3) and (2.2) are Lipschitz in $(\lambda,\mu) \in \mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{M}_1$, as was done in the proof of lemma 7 in $\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{M}_0$. This completes the proof of proposition 13.

c) The remainder of this section is dedicated to the proofs of points 2 and 3. After a preliminary result in section 3.1, we prove a stronger version of point 2, useful in the sequel. The proof of point 3 is made in section 3.3.

As we shall prove these results for a fixed λ, we shall drop the λ in μ_t^λ and σ_t^λ in the sequel. The following elementary result will be used repeatedly; its proof is left to the reader.

LEMMA **16.** *For any* $p \geqslant 1$ *and any* $f \in B_p$, $\big|\{f\}(x,y)\big| \leqslant 2^p\|f\|_p\big(\varphi^p(x)+\varphi^p(y)\big)$.

As a last remark, note that the measures μ_t^N satisfy for any $0 \leqslant t \leqslant T$ and $N \geqslant 0$ the same moment inequality (3.4) as μ_t.

3.1 Properties of $\{\mu_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$

Let $\{\mu_t\}_{0\leqslant t<T(\mu_0)}$ be the solution given by Norris' theorem; choose $T < T(\mu_0)$. It is worth noting that using dominated convergence and the moment estimate (3.4), the measures $\{\mu_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$ satisfy the weak version (1.1) of Smoluchowski equation for any $f \in B_{3+\varepsilon}$.

Whereas the differentiability of the path $\{\mu_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$ as a function of t was an immediate consequence of the boundedness of the vector field $K(\mu,\mu)$ in the case of bounded kernel K, this measure no longer defines a vector field on $\big(\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0\big)$ for an unbounded kernel. Yet, one can still prove that

PROPOSITION **17** (Differentiability)**.** *The path* $\{\mu_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$ *is a* $\mathcal{C}^1$ *path in* $\big(\mathcal{M}_{2+\varepsilon}, \|.\|_{2+\varepsilon}\big)$.

◁ PROOF – One proves that the path $\{\mu_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$ is ***1)*** Lipschitz in $\big(\mathcal{M}_{3+\varepsilon}, \|.\|_{3+\varepsilon}\big)$, ***2)*** $\mathcal{C}^1$ in $\big(\mathcal{M}_{2+\varepsilon}, \|.\|_{2+\varepsilon}\big)$.

1) Take a function $f \in B_{3+\varepsilon}$. One establishes the following inequalities using the inequality $K(x,y) \leqslant \varphi(x)\varphi(y)$ and the sub-additivity of φ.

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|(f, \mu_t - \mu_s)\big| &\leqslant \frac{1}{2}\int_s^t \int \big|\{f\}(x,y)\big| K(x,y)\mu_r(dx)\mu_r(dy)\,dr \\
&\leqslant \frac{c_\varepsilon \|f\|_{3+\varepsilon}}{2}\int_s^t \int \big\{\varphi^{3+\varepsilon}(x) + \varphi^{3+\varepsilon}(y)\big\}\varphi(x)\varphi(y)\mu_r(dx)\mu_r(dy)\,dr \\
&\leqslant 2c_\varepsilon \|f\|_{3+\varepsilon}\int_s^t \int \varphi^{4+\varepsilon}(x)\varphi(y)\mu_r(dx)\mu_r(dy)\,dr \\
&\leqslant 2c_\varepsilon \|f\|_{3+\varepsilon}(\varphi, \mu_0)\sup_{s\leqslant r\leqslant t}\|\mu_r\|_{4+\varepsilon}\,|t-s|.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum of the left hand side, with $\|f\|_{3+\varepsilon} \leqslant 1$, this shows that the path $\{\mu_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$ is Lipschitz in $\big(\mathcal{M}_{3+\varepsilon}, \|.\|_{3+\varepsilon}\big)$, with Lipschitz constant $\leqslant 2c_\varepsilon C(T)^2$.

It follows from this fact that the formula

$$(f, \nu_t) := \frac{1}{2}\int \{f\}(x,y)K(x,y)\mu_t(dx)\mu_t(dy)$$

defines an element ν_t of $\big(\mathcal{M}_{2+\varepsilon}, \|.\|_{2+\varepsilon}\big)$ which is continuous with respect to t. Indeed, since one has for any $f \in B_{2+\varepsilon}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|(f, \nu_t - \nu_s)\big| &= \frac{1}{2}\left|\int \{f\}(x,y)K(x,y)\big\{\mu_t(dx)(\mu_t - \mu_s)(dy) + \mu_s(dy)(\mu_t - \mu_s)(dx)\big\}\right| \\
&\leqslant \frac{c'_\varepsilon \|f\|_{2+\varepsilon}}{2}\int \big(\varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(x) + \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(y)\big)\varphi(x)\varphi(y)\big(\mu_t(dx)|\mu_t - \mu_s|(dy) + \mu_s(dy)|\mu_t - \mu_s|(dx)\big) \\
&\leqslant 2c'_\varepsilon \|f\|_{2+\varepsilon}C(T)\|\mu_t - \mu_s\|_{3+\varepsilon},
\end{aligned}$$

we have $\|\nu_t - \nu_s\|_{2+\varepsilon} \leqslant 8c_\varepsilon c'_\varepsilon C(T)^3\,|t-s|$.

2) Finally, write for any $f \in B_{2+\varepsilon}$

$$\big(f, \mu_t - \mu_s - (t-s)\nu_s\big) = \int_s^t (f, \nu_r - \nu_s)dr,$$

and note that the integral is uniformly $o(t-s)$, for $\|f\|_{2+\varepsilon} \leqslant 1$; this proves that the path $\{\mu_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$ is differentiable, as a path in $\big(\mathcal{M}_{2+\varepsilon}, \|.\|_{2+\varepsilon}\big)$, with continuous derivative ν_t. ▷

Remark. We shall use this result in the form: "*The path $\{\varphi^{2+\varepsilon}\mu_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$ is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ path in $\big(\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0\big)$.*"

3.2 Convergence of μ_t^N to μ_t in $(\mathcal{M}_{2+\varepsilon}, \|.\|_{2+\varepsilon})$

PROPOSITION **18.** *For any $t \in [0,T]$, the sequence of measures $\{\mu_t^N\}_{n\geqslant 0}$ converges to μ_t in $\big(\mathcal{M}_{2+\varepsilon}, \|.\|_{2+\varepsilon}\big)$; the convergence is uniform with respect to $t \in [0,T]$.*

We shall use the following lemma in the proof of this proposition; it is due to Kolokoltsov. We provide a simplified proof of it in section 4, **b)**, which might be worth for itself.

THEOREM **19** (Kolokoltsov's lemma [Kol06], and section 4, **b)**. *Let $\{\rho_s\}_{0\leqslant s\leqslant T}$ be a $\mathcal{C}^1$ path in $(\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0)$, with derivative $\{\dot\rho_s\}_{0\leqslant s\leqslant T}$. There exists a $\{0, \pm 1\}$-valued measurable function $\varepsilon_s(x)$ such that one has*

- $\|\rho_t\|_0 = \|\rho_0\|_0 + \int_0^t (\varepsilon_s, \dot{\rho}_s)\, ds,$ *for any* $t \in [0,T]$
- $\forall\, f \in B,\ \forall\, t \in [0,T], \quad (f, |\rho_t|) = (f\varepsilon_t, \rho_t).$

We shall only use the first point of the conclusion. The following elementary lemma is also used in the proof of proposition 18; its proof is left to the reader.

LEMMA **20.** *Given some* $\alpha \geqslant 1$, *there exists a constant* C_α *such that for any* $a, b \geqslant 0$,

$$(a+b)^\alpha - a^\alpha \leqslant C_\alpha \left(a^{\alpha-1} b + b^\alpha\right).$$

◁ PROOF – Apply Kolokoltsov's lemma to the $\mathcal{C}^1$ path $\left\{\varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(\mu_t^N - \mu_t)\right\}_{0 \leqslant t \leqslant T}$ in $\left(\mathcal{M}_0, \|.\|_0\right)$; denote by ε_s^N the function given by theorem 19. We can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mu_t^N - \mu_t\|_{2+\varepsilon} = \int \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(x) |\mu_t^N - \mu_t|(dx) &= \int_0^t \left(\varepsilon_s^N \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}, \dot{\mu}_s^N - \dot{\mu}_s\right) ds \\
&= \int_0^t \{\varepsilon_s^N \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}\}(x,y) \Big(K^N(x,y) \mu_s^{N \otimes 2} - K(x,y) \mu_s^{\otimes 2}\Big)\, (dx \otimes dy) \\
&= \int_0^t \int \{\varepsilon_s^N \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}\}(x,y) K^N(x,y) \big(\mu_s^{N \otimes 2} - \mu_s^{\otimes 2}\big) (dx \otimes dy)\, ds \\
&+ \int_0^t \int \{\varepsilon_s^N \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}\}(x,y) \big(K^N - K\big)(x,y) \mu_s^{\otimes 2} (dx \otimes dy)\, ds.
\end{aligned}$$

The second term converges to 0 by dominated convergence and the fact that $\|\mu_s\|_{3+\varepsilon}$ is bounded; call it $o_N(1)$. To handle the first term, write it as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t \int \{\varepsilon_s^N \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}\}(x,y) K^N(x,y) \Big((\mu_s^N - \mu_s)(dx) \mu_s^N(dy) + \mu_s(dx)(\mu_s^N - \mu_s)(dy)\Big) \\
&= \int_0^t \int \{\varepsilon_s^N \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}\}(x,y) K^N(x,y) \varepsilon_s^N(x) |\mu_s^N - \mu_s|(dx) \big(\mu_s + \mu_s^N\big)(dy) =: (*);
\end{aligned}$$

we have used the symmetry of the expressions with respect to x and y. Now, using the fact that $\left|\varepsilon_s^N\right| \leqslant 1$ and lemma 20, one can find some constant c_ε such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\varepsilon_s^N \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}\}(x,y) \varepsilon_s^N(x) &\leqslant \varepsilon_s^N(x) \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(x+y) - \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(x) - \varepsilon_s^N(y) \varepsilon_s^N(x) \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(y) \\
&\leqslant \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(x+y) - \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(x) - \varepsilon_s^N(y) \varepsilon_s^N(x) \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(y) \\
&\overset{\text{Lemma 20}}{\leqslant} c_\varepsilon \big(\varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(y) + \varphi^{1+\varepsilon}(x) \varphi(y)\big),
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
(*) &\leqslant c_\varepsilon \int_0^t \int \big(\varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(y) + \varphi^{1+\varepsilon}(x)\varphi(y)\big) K^N(x,y) \big(\mu_s + \mu_s^N\big)(dy) |\mu_s^N - \mu_s|(dx)\, ds \\
&\leqslant c_\varepsilon \int_0^t \Big(2\big(\|\mu_s\|_{3+\varepsilon} \vee \|\mu_s^N\|_{3+\varepsilon}\big) \|\mu_s^N - \mu_s\|_1 + 2\big(\|\mu_s\|_2 \vee \|\mu_s^N\|_2\big) \|\mu_s^N - \mu_s\|_{2+\varepsilon}\Big)\, ds \\
&\leqslant 4 c_\varepsilon C(T) \int_0^t \|\mu_s^N - \mu_s\|_{2+\varepsilon}\, ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting the pieces together, we have obtained

$$\|\mu_t^N - \mu_t\|_{2+\varepsilon} \leqslant o_N(1) + 4 c_\varepsilon C(T) \int_0^t \|\mu_s^N - \mu_s\|_{2+\varepsilon}\, ds,$$

where $o_N(1)$ is uniform in $t \in [0,T]$; Gronwall's lemma enables to conclude. ▷

3.3 Convergence of σ_t^N to σ_t in $\big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$

We shall prove in this section that the measures σ_t^N converge to some measure σ_t in $\big(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1\big)$. Using the explicit formula obtained in section 2.2, **c**:

$$(f, \sigma_t^N) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \left(\Lambda_s^{\partial\lambda\,;\,N} U_{s,t}^N f, \mu_s^N\right) ds,$$

it does not come as a surprise that we shall define σ_t in similar terms. We first define some propagators $U_{s,t}$(4) in paragraph **a)** before proving in **b)** the convergence of σ_t^N to σ_t in $(\mathcal{M}_1, \|.\|_1)$.

a) Propagators $U_{s,t}$. Define an (a priori) unbounded operator on functions setting

$$\Lambda_s f(x) = \int \{f\}(x,y) K(x,y)\mu_s(dy).$$

In order to construct the analogue of the propagators $U_{s,t}^N$ for the unbounded kernel K we shall use the following theorems which are part of the folklore, and for which we refer to the Appendix C of Kolokoltsov's paper [Kol07]. It states conditions under which the backwards/forwards differential equation

$$\dot{u}_s = -\Lambda_s u_s,\ 0 \leqslant s \leqslant t \leqslant T, \quad u_t \text{ given}, \tag{3.6}$$

can be 'solved' in some Banach space of functions. We need some notations to state these theorems. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}_s f(x) \equiv \int \{f(x+y) - f(x)\} K(x,y)\mu_s(dy) &= \int f(x+y)K(x,y)\mu_s(dy) - \left(\int K(x,y)\mu_s(dy)\right) f(x) \\ &\equiv \mathbf{L}_s f(x) - \tau_s(x) f(x), \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_s f(x) &\equiv \int f(y)K(x,y)\mu_s(dy), \\ T_s(x) &\equiv \int_0^s \tau_r(x)dr. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Considering the backwards/forwards differential equation

$$\dot{f}_s = -\mathbf{J}_s f_s,\ 0 \leqslant s \leqslant t \leqslant T, \quad f_t \text{ given}, \tag{3.9}$$

as a perturbation of the integrable equation $\dot{f}_s = \tau_s f_s$, one sees that equation (3.9) is formally equivalent to the integral equation

$$f_s = e^{T_s - T_t} f_t + \int_s^t e^{T_s - T_r} \mathbf{L}_r f_r \, dr. \tag{3.10}$$

Notation. Given some positive function h, set $B_h = \big\{f\,;\, \sup \frac{|f|}{h} < \infty\big\}$, and define $\|f\|_h = \sup \frac{|f|}{h}$, for $f \in B_h$. The space $\big(B_h, \|.\|_h\big)$ is a Banach space. Define also B_h^0 as the set of functions $f \in B_h$ such that $\frac{f}{h}$ goes to 0 as h goes to infinity.

---

[4] Recall that a ***propagator*** is a family $\{U_{s,t}\}_{s\leqslant t}$ of operators such that $U_{tt} = \mathrm{Id}$ and one has $U_{st}U_{tr} = U_{sr}$ for all $s \leqslant t \leqslant r$.

THEOREM **21** (Existence of propagators, first part)**.** ***1)*** *Suppose that there exists two continuous positive functions* h *and* h'*, and positive constants* c *and* c' *such that*

a. $0 < h' \leqslant h$, $h' \in B_h$,

$$\forall\, s \in [0,T], \quad \mathbf{J}_s h' \leqslant c' h', \ \mathbf{J}_s h \leqslant ch.$$

Then, given $t \in [0,T]$ *and some function* $u_t \in B_h$*, the minimal solution of the backwards/forwards integral problem* (3.10) *with final/initial condition* u_t *is of the form* $\{S_{s,t} u_t\}_s$ *for some bounded operators* $S_{s,t}$ *on* $(B_h^0, \|.\|_h)$ *depending continuously on* s *and* t*, with norm no greater than* $\mathrm{e}^{c|t-s|}$*.*

If now one considers the backwards/forwards differential equation

$$\dot{f}_s = -\Lambda_s f_s = -\big(\mathbf{J}_s - \mathbf{M}_s\big) f_s, \ 0 \leqslant s \leqslant t \leqslant T, \quad f_t = f \ \text{ given},$$

as a perturbation of equation (3.9), the preceding differential equation is formally equivalent to the integral equation

$$f_s = S_{s,t} f - \int_s^t S_{s,r} \mathbf{M}_r f_r \, dr. \tag{3.11}$$

THEOREM **22** (Existence of propagators, second part)**.** ***2)*** *Suppose, in addition to the hypothesis of theorem 21, that the following hypothesis on the perturbations* $\mathbf{M}_s$ *hold.*

b. *The family* $\{\mathbf{M}_s\}_{0 \leqslant s \leqslant T}$ *is a bounded family of linear transforms of* $(B_h, \|.\|_h)$*.*

Denote by $\|\mathbf{M}_s\|_h$ *the norm operator of* $\mathbf{M}_s$*. Then the series*

$$U_{s,t} f = S_{s,t} f - \int_s^t S_{s,r} \mathbf{M}_r S_{r,t} f \, dr + \int_{s \leqslant r_1 \leqslant r_2 \leqslant t} S_{s,r_1} \mathbf{M}_{r_1} S_{r_1,r_2} \mathbf{M}_{r_2} S_{r_2,t} f \, dr_1 dr_2 + \cdots ,$$

converges in $(B_h, \|.\|_h)$ *for any* $f \in B_h$*. It defines a propagator on* $\big(B_h^0, \|.\|_h\big)$ *depending continuously on* s *and* t*, and with norm*

$$\leqslant e^{\left(c + \sup\limits_{s \leqslant r \leqslant t} \|\mathbf{M}_r\|_h\right)|t-s|} \tag{3.12}$$

The map $s \mapsto U_{s,t} f$ *is the minimal solution of the backwards/forwards integral problem* (3.11) *with final/initial condition* f*.*

3) *If finally*

c. • *for any* $f \in B_{h'}$*, the function* $s \mapsto \mathbf{J}_s f \in (B_h^0, \|.\|_h)$ *is well defined and continuous,*

• *each* $\mathbf{M}_s$ *sends continuously* $(B_h, \|.\|_h)$ *in* $(B_{h'}, \|.\|_{h'})$*,*

then for any $f \in B_{h'}$*, the function* $s \mapsto U_{s,t} f \in \big(B_h^0, \|.\|_h\big)$ *is differentiable, with derivative* $-\Lambda_s U^{s,t} f$*. It is also differentiable as a function of* t*, with derivative* $U_{s,t} \Lambda_t f$*.*

We shall apply this theorem with the two pairs of functions (h', h) given by $\big(\varphi^{1+\varepsilon}, \varphi^3\big)$ and $\big(\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}, \varphi^{1+\varepsilon}\big)$.

COROLLARY **23.** *1. Given* $f \in B_3^0$*, equation* (3.11) *has a well defined minimal solution* $U_{s,t} f$*, for some uniformly bounded operator* $U_{s,t}$ *on* $\big(B_3^0, \|.\|_3\big)$*. The functions* $s, t \mapsto U_{s,t} f$ *are differentiable in* $\big(B_3^0, \|.\|_0\big)$*, for* $f \in B_{1+\varepsilon}$*; their respective derivatives are* $-\Lambda_s U_{s,t} f$ *and* $U_{s,t} \Lambda_t f$*.*

2. These operators $U_{s,t}$ *preserve* $B_{1+\varepsilon}^0$*, and are bounded in* $\big(B_{1+\varepsilon}^0, \|.\|_{1+\varepsilon}\big)$*.*

◁ Proof – *1.* The first point is an immediate corollary of theorems 21 and 22 once we have checked that the inequalities

- $\mathbf{J}_s\varphi^\alpha \leqslant C(\alpha)\|\mu_s\|_{\alpha+1}\varphi^\alpha$,
- $\big|\mathbf{M}_s\big(\varphi^\alpha\big)\big| \leqslant \|\mu_s\|_{\alpha+1}\varphi$,
- for any $f\in B_\beta$, $\qquad \mathbf{J}_s f \leqslant 2^{\beta+1}\big(\varphi^{\beta+1}(x)\|\mu_s\|_1 + \varphi(x)\|\mu_s\|_{\beta+1}\big)$.

hold for any α and $\beta\geqslant 1$; this is easily done, using lemma 20.

2. The second point is obtained applying theorems 21 and 22 to the pair $\big(\varphi^{\frac12},\varphi^{1+\varepsilon}\big)$: one just needs to verify that

Lemma **24.** $\mathbf{J}_s\varphi^{\frac12} \leqslant \dfrac{C(T)}{2}\varphi^{\frac12}$.

This can be seen by writing

$$\begin{aligned}\int\big\{\varphi^{\frac12}(x+y)-\varphi^{\frac12}(x)\big\}K(x,y)\mu_s(dy) &\leqslant \int\Big\{\big(\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\big)^{\frac12}-\varphi^{\frac12}(x)\Big\}\,K(x,y)\mu_s(dy)\\ &\leqslant \int\frac{\varphi(y)}{2\varphi^{\frac12}(x)}\varphi(x)\varphi(y)\mu_s(dy) = \frac{\|\mu_s\|_2}{2}\varphi^{\frac12}(x)\\ &\leqslant \frac{C(T)}{2}\varphi^{\frac12}.\end{aligned}$$

▷

Note that the upper bound (3.12) on the norm of the propagators is equally valid for $U_{s,t}$ and for its approximations $U^N_{s,t}$, independently of N. This remark will be useful in the beginning of the proof of proposition 26.

b) Convergence of σ^N_t to σ_t in $(\mathcal{M}_1,\|.\|_1)$. Since $U_{s,t}$ sends $B^0_{1+\varepsilon}$ in itself, and $\Lambda^{\partial\lambda}_s$ is easily verified to be a bounded operator from $B_{1+\varepsilon}$ into $B_{2+\varepsilon}$, with a uniformly bounded norm for $0\leqslant s\leqslant t\leqslant T$, the formula

$$(f,\sigma_t) = \frac12\int_0^t\Big(\Lambda^{\partial\lambda}_s U_{s,t}f,\mu_s\Big)\,ds \tag{3.13}$$

defines a measure σ_t belonging to $\mathcal{M}_1$. The results of the previous paragraph imply that the quantities $\big(f,\sigma^N_t\big)$ and $\big(f,\sigma_t\big)$ are bounded uniformly in $t\in[0,T]$, $N\geqslant 0$ and $\lambda\in\mathcal{U}$, given any $f\in B_1$. This remark will be used later.

Theorem **25.** *The sequence $\big\{\sigma^N_t\big\}_{N\geqslant 0}$ converges to σ_t in $(\mathcal{M}_1,\|.\|_1)$. This convergence is uniform with respect to $t\in[0,T]$.*

The proof of this theorem occupies the remainder of this section. We shall use the convenient formula (2.11) for σ_t. So, we need to prove that the limit

$$\big(f,\sigma^N_t\big) = \frac12\int_0^t\big\{U^N_{s,t}f\big\}\,K^{\partial\lambda\,;\,N}\big(\mu^N_s\big)^{\otimes 2}\,ds \underset{N,+\infty}{\longrightarrow} \frac12\int_0^t\big\{U_{s,t}f\big\}\,K^{\partial\lambda}\big(\mu_s\big)^{\otimes 2}\,ds = (f,\sigma_t)$$

holds uniformly for $\|f\|_1\leqslant 1$ and $0\leqslant t\leqslant T$. If one can prove that $U^N_{s,t}f$ converges to $U_{s,t}f$ in $B_{1+\varepsilon}$, uniformly in $0\leqslant s\leqslant t\leqslant T$, then

- the inequality: $\quad K^{\partial\lambda\,;\,N}(x,y)\leqslant\varphi(x)\varphi(y)$,
- and the fact that μ^N_s converges to μ_s in $\big(\mathcal{M}_{2+\varepsilon},\|.\|_{2+\varepsilon}\big)$, uniformly in s,

will enable us to apply dominated convergence to get the result. We are thus led to prove that

PROPOSITION **26.** *There exists a decreasing sequence* $\{a_n\}_{n\geqslant 0}$ *converging to* 0 *such that one has*

$$\big\|U_{s,t}f - U^N_{s,t}f\|_{1+\varepsilon} \leqslant a_n\big\|f\|_1,$$

for any $0\leqslant s\leqslant t\leqslant T$ *and any* $f\in B_1$.

◁ PROOF – Since $f\in B_1\subset B_{1+\varepsilon}$ one can use the differentiability property of $U_{s,t}$ as a function of s and t to write

$$U_{s,t}f - U^N_{s,t}f = \int_s^t \frac{d}{du}\left(U_{s,u}U^N_{u,t}\right) f\,du = \int_s^t \left(U_{s,u}\big(\Lambda_u - \Lambda^N_u\big)U^N_{u,t}\right) f\,du.$$

As $U^N_{u,t}f$ belongs to $B^0_{1+\varepsilon}$, with a norm uniformly controlled for $\|f\|_1\leqslant 1$(5), and as $U_{s,u}$ is a uniformly bounded operator on $B_{2+\varepsilon}$, it suffices to prove the following

LEMMA **27.** *There exists a decreasing sequence* $\{a_n\}_{n\geqslant 0}$ *converging to* 0 *such that one has*

$$\big\|\big(\Lambda_u - \Lambda^N_u\big)g\big\|_{2+\varepsilon} \leqslant a_n,$$

for any $g\in B_{1+\varepsilon}$, *with* $\|g\|_{1+\varepsilon}\leqslant 1$.

To prove this lemma, write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big|\big(\Lambda^\lambda_u - \Lambda^{\lambda\,;\,N}_u\big)g(x)\big| = \left|\int \{g\}(x,y)\Big(K(x,y)\mu_s(dy) - K^N(x,y)\mu^N_s(dy)\Big)\right| \\
&\leqslant c_\varepsilon \int \big(\varphi^{1+\varepsilon}(x) + \varphi(y)\big)\Big(K(x,y)|\mu_s - \mu^N_s|(dy) + |K-K^N|(x,y)\mu_s(dy) + 2\varphi(x)\varphi(y)|\mu^N_s - \mu_s|(dy)\Big) \\
&\leqslant c_\varepsilon\varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(x)\|\mu^N_s - \mu_s\|_1 + c_\varepsilon\varphi(x)\|\mu_s - \mu^N_s\|_{2+\varepsilon} + c_\varepsilon\varphi^{1+\varepsilon}(x)\left(|K-K^N|(x,.),\mu_s\right) \\
&\qquad\qquad + c_\varepsilon\left(\varphi^{1+\varepsilon}(.)|K-K^N|(x,.),\mu_s\right) + c_\varepsilon\varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(x)\|\mu^N_s - \mu_s\|_1 + c_\varepsilon\varphi(x)\|\mu^N_s - \mu_s\|_{2+\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

This formula makes it clear that lemma 27 will be proved if we can prove that the function

$$x\mapsto \int \varphi^{1+\varepsilon}(y)|K-K^N|(x,y)\mu_s(dy)$$

converges to 0 in $B_{2+\varepsilon}$. To show this fact, use the fact that $K^N = K$ on the set $\{K\leqslant N\}$, and write

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(x)}\int \varphi^{1+\varepsilon}(y)|K-K^N|(x,y)\mu_s(dy) &\leqslant \frac{1}{\varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(x)}\int \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(y)\varphi(x)\mathbf{1}_{\varphi(x)\varphi(y)\geqslant N}\mu_s(dy) \\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{\varphi^{1+\varepsilon}(x)}\int \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(y)\mathbf{1}_{\varphi(x)\varphi(y)\geqslant N}\mu_s(dy) \\
&\overset{\varphi\geqslant 1}{\leqslant} \frac{\|\mu_s\|_{2+\varepsilon}}{M^{1+\varepsilon}}\mathbf{1}_{\varphi(x)\geqslant M} + \left(\int \varphi^{2+\varepsilon}(y)\mathbf{1}_{\varphi(y)\geqslant\frac{N}{M}}\mu_s(dy)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\varphi(x)\leqslant M}.
\end{aligned}$$

▷

The proof of proposition 26 completes the proof of theorem 25 on the convergence of σ^N_t to σ_t. Propositions 13, 18 and theorem 25 are what we need to complete the proof of the main part of theorem 12, as described in section 3, **a)**.

---

[5] Remember the remark following lemma 24.

It remains to prove that one has

$$\left(f,\sigma_t^\lambda\right)=\left(f,\sigma_0^\lambda\right)+\int_0^t\int\{f\}(x,y)K^\lambda(x,y)\mu_s^\lambda(dx)\sigma_s^\lambda(dy)ds+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int\{f\}(x,y)K^{\partial\lambda}(x,y)\mu_s^\lambda(dx)\mu_s^\lambda(dy)ds \tag{3.14}$$

for any *bounded* function f and that σ_t^λ is the only solution to this equation belonging to $\big(\mathcal{M}_1,\|\cdot\|_1\big)$.

We have seen in section 2.2 that this identity holds if one replaces σ_t^λ by $\sigma_t^{\lambda\,;N}$ and μ_t^λ by $\mu_t^{\lambda\,;N}$. Use then the convergence results $\sigma_t^{\lambda\,;N}\xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|_1}\sigma_t^\lambda$ and $\mu_t^{\lambda\,;N}\xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|_{2+\varepsilon}}\mu_t^\lambda$ as well as the inequalities

$$\Big|\big(f,K^\lambda(\mu_t^\lambda,\sigma_t^\lambda)\big)-\big(f,K^\lambda(\mu_t^{\lambda\,;N},\sigma_t^{\lambda\,;N})\big)\Big|\leqslant 3\|f\|_\infty\Big(\|\mu_t^\lambda-\mu_t^{\lambda\,;N}\|_1\,\|\sigma_t^\lambda\|_1+\|\mu_t^{\lambda\,;N}\|_1\,\|\sigma_t^\lambda-\sigma_t^{\lambda\,;N}\|_1\Big),$$
$$\Big|\big(f,K^{\partial\lambda}(\mu_t^\lambda,\mu_t^\lambda)\big)-\big(f,K^{\partial\lambda}(\mu_t^{\lambda\,;N},\mu_t^{\lambda\,;N})\big)\Big|\leqslant 3C(T)\,\|f\|_\infty\Big(\|\mu_t^\lambda-\mu_t^{\lambda\,;N}\|_1+\|\sigma_t^\lambda-\sigma_t^{\lambda\,;N}\|_1\Big),$$

to pass to the limit properly.

To prove uniqueness of the solution to equation (3.14) in $\big(\mathcal{M}_1,\|\cdot\|_1\big)$ it suffices to show that the equation

$$\forall\, f\in B_c,\quad (f,\gamma_t)=\int_0^t\int\{f(x+y)-f(x)-f(y)\}K(x,y)\mu_s(dx)\gamma_s(dy)ds$$

has at most one solution in $\big(\mathcal{M}_1,\|\cdot\|_1\big)$. We have written here B_c for the set of bounded Borel functions with compact support. Note that this equation can be re-written

$$(f,\gamma_t)=\int_0^t\big(\Lambda_s f,\gamma_s\big)ds.$$

Repeating the proof of corollary 23, it is seen that given $f\in B_c(\subset B_1^0)$ and $t\in[0,T]$ there exists bounded propagators $U_{s,t}$ on $\big(B_1^0,\|\cdot\|_1\big)$ such that the function $s\in[0,t]\mapsto U_{s,t}f$ solves the equation $\frac{d}{ds}U_{s,t}f=-\Lambda_s U_{s,t}f$. It follows from this fact that the expression $(U_{s,t}f,\gamma_s)$ is well defined and that

$$\frac{d}{ds}(U_{s,t}f,\gamma_s)=\big(-\Lambda_s U_{s,t}f,\gamma_s\big)+\big(\Lambda_s U_{s,t}f,\gamma_s\big)=0;$$

so (f,γ_t) has to be equal to $(U_{0,t}f,\gamma_0)$. This completes the proof of the uniqueness statement and ends the proof of theorem 12.

4 Comments

a) Related works. One can see the main roots of theorem 12 in section 4 of Kolokoltsov's pioneering article [Kol07] on the central limit theorem for the Marcus-Lushnikov dynamics. He develops in this section tools for the analysis of the rate of convergence of the semi-group of Marcus-Lushnikov process to the semi-group of solutions of Smoluchowski equation. Recall the Marcus-Lushnikov process $\big\{X_t^n\big\}_{t\geqslant 0}$ is a strong Markov jump process on the space of discrete measures whose jumps are as follows. If its state at time t is $\dfrac{1}{n}\sum\delta_{x_i(t)}$, for i in a finite set I_t depending on t, define, for $i<j$ in I_t, independent exponential random times T_{ij} with parameter $\dfrac{K\big(x_i(t),x_j(t)\big)}{n}$ and set

$$T=\min\{T_{ij}\,;\,i<j\}.$$

The process remains constant on the time interval $[t, t+T[$ and has a jump $\frac{1}{n}\big(\delta_{x_p(t)+x_q(t)} - \delta_{x_p(t)} - \delta_{x_q(t)}\big)$ at time $t+T$, if $T = T_{pq}$. The dynamics then starts afresh. The convergence of this sequence $\{X^n\}_{n\geqslant 0}$ of processes to the deterministic solution of Smoluchowski equation was first proved under general conditions in [Nor99]. Yet, no fine analysis of the convergence of the corresponding semi-group was done before [Kol07]. We explain roughly his idea to see how similar equations to the 'variation' equations (1.3), (1.4) appear in his context.

Suppose we are in a situation where existence and uniqueness of solutions to Smoluchowski equation hold into a proper sense, and denote by $\{T_t\}$ and $\{T^n_t\}$ the semi-groups of Smoluchowski and Marcus-Lushnikov dynamics. Also, denote by L and L^n their generators. Then, given any (good) function F and a measure μ

$$\big(T_t - T^n_t\big)F\,(\mu) = \int_0^t \Big(T^n_{t-s}\big(L^n - L\big)T_s F\Big)(\mu)\,ds.$$

The choice of a function F of the form $F(\mu) = \int g(\mathbf{x})\mu^{\otimes k}(d\mathbf{x})$, for some symmetric function g of k variables, provides a 'measure' of the moments of μ. One has $T_s F\,(\mu) = F(\mu_s)$, where $\mu_0 = \mu$.

Introducing some derivation operation δ on functions on measures:

$$\delta F(\mu\,;\,x) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\frac{F(\mu+\varepsilon\delta_x) - F(\mu)}{\varepsilon},$$

one can write for any function G

$$\big(L^n - L\big)G\,(\mu) = -\frac{1}{2n}\int\big(\delta G(\mu\,;\,2x) - 2\delta G(\mu\,;\,x)\big)K(x,x)\mu(dx) + O\big(n^{-3/2}\big). \tag{4.1}$$

One thus sees that taking $G = T_s F$, with the above F, leads to consider the quantity

$$\delta\big((g,\mu_t^{\otimes k})\big) = k\,\big((g,\mu_t^{\otimes k-1}\otimes\delta\mu_t)\big),$$

where

$$\delta\mu_t = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\frac{\mu_t(\mu+\varepsilon\delta_x) - \mu_t(\mu)}{\varepsilon}$$

is 'the' derivative of μ_t with respect to its initial condition. Terms of the form $\delta(\delta\mu_t)$ arise in the $O\big(n^{-3/2}\big)$ term of equation (4.1). This analysis brings back the estimate of $\big(T_t - T^n_t\big)F\,(\mu)$ to estimates on $\mu_s, \delta\mu_s$ and $\delta^2\mu_s$. To do so, Kolokoltsov shows that $\delta\mu_s$ is a solution of the linear equation

$$\frac{d}{ds}\delta\mu_s = K\big(\mu_s, \delta\mu_s\big)$$

in some sense, and that $\delta^2\mu_s$ is a solution of the affine equation

$$\frac{d}{ds}\delta^2\mu_s = K\big(\mu_s, \delta^2\mu_s\big) + K\big(\delta\mu_s, \delta\mu_s\big)$$

in some sense. The tools used to solve these equations are essentially the same as those used above; the reader may will find the details given here helpful to unzip the section 4 of [Kol07]. We have used yet a slightly different approach in the implementation of the variation of constant method. Note also that we have been able to go from the framework of 'sub-linear' kernels of [Kol07]: $K(x,y) \leqslant C(1+x+y)$, to the framework of an essentially 'sub-multiplicative' kernel: $K(x,y) \leqslant \varphi(x)\,\varphi(y)$, an improvement which is of some practical interest.

b) Kolokoltsov's lemma. This paragraph contains a simple proof of Kolokoltsov's lemma, refered to in the text as proposition 19, and used in a crucial way to prove a uniqueness result in the original article [Kol06] where it was first introduced. We prove it here in a slightly less general framework than in [Kol06], sufficient for our purposes as well as for its use in [Kol06]; the gain in clarity and volume of the proof is substantial.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ be a measurable space with a σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ generated by a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n\geqslant 0}$ made up of finite σ-algebras. We shall denote by $\{A_n^p\}_p$ the atoms of $\mathcal{F}_n$. We shall write $(\mathcal{M}, \|.\|)$ for the space of finite signed-measures on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, equipped with the total variation distance. We shall define, for each $n \geqslant 1$, the total variation of a measure with respect to $\mathcal{F}_n$:

$$\forall\, \mu \in \mathcal{M}, \quad \|\mu\|_{(n)} = \sup\big\{(f,\mu)\,;\, f \in \mathcal{F}_n,\, |f| \leqslant 1\big\}.$$

These quantities have the property

$$\forall\, \mu \in \mathcal{M}, \quad \|\mu\|_{(n)} \underset{n+\infty}{\longrightarrow} \|\mu\|. \tag{4.2}$$

Recall that the topological dual space of $(\mathcal{M}, \|.\|)$ is the space $(\mathcal{B}, |.|)$ of bounded measurable functions on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, equipped with the supremum norm. We shall write $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ for the set of bounded functions g on $[0,T] \times \Omega$, with norm $\widehat{\|g\|} = \sup\big\{g_s(x)\,;\, s \in [0,T],\, x \in \Omega\big\}$, and shall define $\Big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}, \|.\|_{TV}\Big)$ as the space of finite signed measures on $[0,T] \times \Omega$, equipped with the total variation norm.

Theorem **28** (Kolokoltsov's lemma [Kol06], Appendix)**.** *Let $\{\rho_s\}_{0\leqslant s\leqslant T}$ be a $\mathcal{C}^1$ path in $(\mathcal{M}, \|.\|)$, with derivative $\{\dot\rho_s\}_{0\leqslant s\leqslant T}$. There exists a $\{\pm 1, 0\}$-valued measurable function $\varepsilon_s(x)$ such that we have*

- $\|\rho_t\| = \|\rho_0\| + \int_0^t (\varepsilon_s, \dot\rho_s)\, ds,$ *for any* $t \in [0,T]$,
- $\forall\, f \in \mathcal{B}, \forall\, t \in [0,T], \quad (f, |\rho_t|) = (f\varepsilon_t, \rho_t).$

We shall make use of the following elementary lemma in the course of the proof of theorem 28.

Lemma **29.** *By convention,* $\mathrm{sgn}(0) = 0$. *We have for any $\mathcal{C}^1$ function $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$*

$$\big|g(t)\big| = \big|g(0)\big| + \int_0^t \mathrm{sgn}(g(s))\, g'(s) ds.$$

◁ Proof – Using lemma 29 in each set A_n^p, we can define a $\{\pm 1, 0\}$-valued function $s \mapsto \varepsilon_s^{n;p}$ such that

$$\big|\rho_t(A_n^p)\big| = \big|\rho_0(A_n^p)\big| + \int_0^t \varepsilon_s^{n;p} \dot\rho_s(A_n^p)\, ds.$$

Define then the function $\varepsilon_s^n(x)$ as being equal to $\varepsilon_s^{n;p}$ on A_n^p; the preceding identity yields

$$\|\rho_t\|_{(n)} = \|\rho_0\|_{(n)} + \int_0^t (\varepsilon_s^n, \dot\rho_s)\, ds. \tag{4.3}$$

The functions ε^n belong to the set $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ of bounded functions on $[0,T] \times \Omega$, and have supremum norm no greater than 1. Using the duality between $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ provided by integration, equation (4.3) can be written

$$\|\rho_t\|_{(n)} = \|\rho_0\|_{(n)} + \big(\varepsilon^n, \dot\rho_s \otimes ds\big). \tag{4.4}$$

Now, since $\left(\widehat{\mathcal{B}}, \widehat{\|.\|}\right)$ is the topological dual space of $\left(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}, \|.\|_{TV}\right)$, its unit sphere is weakly-* compact. We can thus find a sub-sequence $\{\varepsilon^{n_k}\}_{k\geqslant 1}$ and an element ε of $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$, with norm less than 1, such that

$$\forall\, \mu \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}, \quad (\varepsilon^{n_k}, \mu) \underset{k+\infty}{\longrightarrow} (\varepsilon, \mu).$$

Together with formulas (4.2) and (4.4), this convergence result, applied to the measures $\dot{\rho}_s(dx)\otimes \mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}(s)ds$, gives

$$\forall\, t \in [0,T], \quad \|\rho_t\| = \|\rho_0\| + \int_0^t (\varepsilon_s, \dot{\rho}_s)\, ds. \tag{4.5}$$

To prove the second point of theorem 28, remark that since

$$\int_0^T \|\rho_s\|_{(n)} ds = \int_0^T (\varepsilon^n_s, \rho_s) ds = (\varepsilon^n, \rho_s \otimes \mathbf{1}_{[0,T]} ds),$$

we have

$$\||\rho_s| \otimes ds\|_{TV} = (\varepsilon, \rho_s \otimes \mathbf{1}_{[0,T]} ds).$$

It follows that

$$\varepsilon_s \rho_s = |\rho_s|$$

for almost all s. Define ε_s to be equal to $\frac{d\rho_s}{d|\rho_s|}$ on the exceptional set. This modification of ε_s preserves identity (4.5) and proves the second point of theorem 28. ▷

Acknoledgements. The author would like to thank James Norris for his interest about this work.

References

[BGKM07] A. Braumann, M. Goodson, M. Kraft, and P. Mort. Modelling and validation of granulation with heterogeneous binder dispersion and chemical reaction. *Chemical Engeneering Science*, 62:4717–4728, 2007.

[BM09] I. Bailleul and P. Man. A stochastic algorithm for sensitivity in Smoluchowski equation. *In preparation*, 2009.

[KMN09] M. Kraft, P. Man, and J. Norris. Coupling algorithm for calculating sensitivities in population balances. *In preparation*, 2009.

[Kol06] V. N. Kolokoltsov. Kinetic equations for the pure jump models of k-nary interacting particle systems. *Markov Process. Related Fields*, 12(1):95–138, 2006.

[Kol07] V.N. Kolokoltsov. The central limit theorem for the Smolukovski coagulation model. *Preprint, 2007*, 2007.

[KP07] M. Kraft and R.I. Patterson. Weighted particle methods for the Smoluchowski coagulation equation. *Technical Report 47, c4e-Preprint Series,Cambridge*, 2007.

[Kra06] M. Kraft. Modelling of particulate processes. *American Chemical Society: Preprint Papers, Division of Fuel Chemistry, 51 (1)*, pages 172–173, 2006.

[KV04] M. Kraft and A. Vikhansky. A monte carlo method for identifcation and sensitivity analysis of coagulation processes. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 200:50–59, 2004.

[Nor99] James R. Norris. Smoluchowski's coagulation equation: uniqueness, nonuniqueness and a hydrodynamic limit for the stochastic coalescent. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 9(1):78–109, 1999.

[vS16] M. van Smoluchowski. Drei vortrage uber diffusion. *Brownsche Bewegung und Koagulation von Kolloidteilchen. Physik. Z.*, pages 557–585, 1916.